

Joseph A. DiRuzzo, III, Esq., CPA jd@margulisgelfand.com

July 26, 2024

Via ECF

Hon. Robyn F. Tarnofsky Magistrate Judge United States District Court, Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street, Room 703 New York, NY 10007

Re: Gagliardi, et al. v. Prager Metis CPAs, LLC, et al.; Case No. 23-cv-07454 (JGLC)

Dear Judge Tarnofsky:

I have reviewed the Defendants' memorandum (Doc. # 63-3), and having reviewed the Circuit's decision in *Matimak Trading Co. v. Khalily*, 118 F.3d 76, 85 (2d Cir. 1997), *abrogated by JPMorgan Chase Bank v. Traffic Stream (BVI) Infrastructure Ltd.*, 536 U.S. 88 (2002) (noting that the terms "citizen" and "subject" do not connote a different degree of attachment/allegiance to a foreign state, instead, the terms are meant to encompass persons living under distinct forms of government: a monarchy has "subjects," while a republic has "citizens"). Accordingly, I believe that the Defendants are correct that Mr. Gagliardi, as a U.S. citizen residing in the U.K., destroys diversity jurisdiction.

However, the Plaintiffs desire to amend their complaint. While the undersigned needs to conduct further legal research it appears that, at a minimum, Mr. Gagliardi can be dropped as a plaintiff leaving Mrs. Gagliardi to prosecute this case. Mrs. Gagliardi is a citizen of Italy (the undersigned has a copy of her Italian passport), residing in the U.K. (and is not an American citizen). This would result in a foreign national being adverse to American nationals (i.e. the Defendants as "citizens" of New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, California, and Connecticut). See Doc. # 63-1 at ¶19. In the alternative, the undersigned is reaching and considering filing a Second Amended Complaint alleging jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction).

I would ask for two weeks (i.e. August 9th) to file a Second Amended Complaint.

Kind Regards,

/s/ Joseph A. DiRuzzo, III

Joseph A. DiRuzzo, III cc: counsel of record via ECF only